



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,338	02/17/2004	Richard W. Murphy	1036-3CIP	1096
31292	7590	09/29/2006	EXAMINER	
CHRISTOPHER & WEISBERG, P.A. 200 EAST LAS OLAS BOULEVARD SUITE 2040 FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301			REDMAN, JERRY E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3634	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/780,338

Applicant(s)

MURPHY ET AL.

Examiner

Jerry Redman

Art Unit

3634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Since the Examiner failed to address claim 8 in the previous office action, a new non-final action is herein addressed below.

Status of the claims is as follows:

Claim 10 has been cancelled; and

Claims 1-9 are herein addressed below.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Loper ('212,242). Loper (212,242) discloses a wall opening fall protection support system comprising a pair of brackets having a planer mounting portion (D), a support portion (F) forming a bottom of a "U", a retaining portion (G) joined to the support portion (F), an engagement portion (E), and a rail (C).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.


Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loper (212,242). All of the elements of the instant invention are discussed in detail above except providing the mounting portion with a 2"x4" or a 4"x4" opening. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the opening of the mounting portion of Loper with a 2"x4" or a 4"x4" opening since 2"x4" or a 4"x4" wood studs are common in construction and would have been a matter of design choice to provide common and standard dimensions in the opening of the mounting portion to accept standard size dimension wood studs.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. patent to Calle et al. (6,481,252 B2) discloses a bracket system similar to that of the applicant's invention.

The applicant's arguments have been considered but are not deemed persuasive. It appears that the applicant's arguments are more limiting than that of the claims. The applicant argues that element D of Loper is not substantially planar. The Examiner disagrees. As one can see in the Figures and specifically, Figures 2 and 3, element D has a substantially planar outer surface, which reads on, the claims as recited by the applicant. Furthermore, the applicant argues that element F is also not substantially planar. Again, the Examiner disagrees since element F of Loper has substantially planar along several sides which reads on the applicant's recited claims.

Art Unit: 3634

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jerry Redman at telephone number 703-308-2120.



Jerry Redman
Primary Examiner